



Paper No. 15

**CHARLES W. ASHBROOK  
WARNER - LAMBERT COMPANY  
2800 PLYMOUTH ROAD  
ANN ARBOR, MI 48105**

**COPY MAILED**

**MAR 22 2004**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of  
Brandman et al.  
Application No. 10/007,158  
Filed: December 5, 2001  
Attorney Docket No. A0000483-01-CA

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b), filed February 17, 2004, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **granted**.

This application became abandoned for failure to timely reply within three months to the final Office action mailed June 4, 2003. No extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Accordingly, this application became abandoned on September 5, 2003. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on January 12, 2004.

Petitioner has met the requirements to revive the above-identified application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b).

**The Notice of Appeal filed February 17, 2004, has been entered and made of record. Accordingly, the 2-month period for filing the appeal brief, in triplicate, accompanied by the fee required by law, runs from the date of this decision.**

There is no indication that the person signing the instant petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. If the person signing the instant petition desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney or authorization of agent must be submitted. The change of correspondence address filed February 17, 2004, cannot be accepted because it was not signed by an attorney of record. See MPEP §§ 601.03 and 405. While a courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the person signing the instant petition, all future correspondence will be directed solely to the address currently of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary.

It is not apparent whether the statement of unintentional delay was signed by a person who would have been in a position of knowing that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. Nevertheless, in accordance with 37 CFR 10.18, the statement is accepted as constituting a certification of unintentional delay. However, in the event that petitioner has no knowledge that the delay was unintentional, petitioner must make such an inquiry to ascertain that, in fact, the delay was unintentional. If petitioner discovers that the delay was intentional,

petitioner must notify the Office.

The file is now being forwarded to Technology Center 1600 for further processing.

Telephone inquiries should be directed to the undersigned at (703) 306-0482.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Liana Chase".

Liana Chase  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy

cc: RAYMOND R. MANDRA  
FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112-3800